

vote. No sooner had he become Democratic leader than he was forced to deal with the Republican revolution of 1994, including House Speaker Newt Gingrich and his short-lived "Contract With America." I never read it, never signed it, and was not a disciple of it.

While he served as the Democratic leader for nearly a decade, there was a period of 17 months in which he went from minority leader to majority leader and back to minority leader.

He was the Senate Democratic leader during the first impeachment of an American President in 131 years. He was the Senate Democratic leader on September 11, 2001, when America experienced the worst terrorist attack in the history of this great land. One month later, a bioterrorist attack on his Senate office in the Hart Building exposed 20 of TOM DASCHLE's staffers to deadly anthrax spores.

As the Senate Democratic leader, Mr. DASCHLE has had to deal with three different Republican leaders. During these turbulent circumstances, he remained reassuring and inspiring. TOM DASCHLE's soothing personality and his mild-mannered demeanor were comforting under very trying circumstances.

Looking back, it seems strange that many people once considered this likable, soft-spoken young man to be too likable and too soft spoken to be an effective Senate leader. I am pleased and proud to say that we were wrong. I say "we" because many people will recall that I initially opposed his candidacy for Senate Democratic leadership. But after TOM DASCHLE was elected leader, I was impressed as I found him to be an engaging man with whom to work, a most interesting man, a leader who has a way of putting other people at ease, even in troubled as well as in pleasant times.

He was always working to seek a consensus. He was always listening. He was one of the best listeners I have ever met during my 46 years in this body.

Even in the Senate's darkest moments, he retained his sense of optimism, always preferring to see the glass as half full rather than half empty. And that optimism was infectious. Therefore, 2 years later, it was my pleasure to nominate TOM DASCHLE for reelection as Senate Democratic leader. In nominating him, I announced:

I was totally wrong about this young man. He has steel in his spine, despite his reasonable and modest demeanor.

As a former Senate leader myself, I can say that a Senate leader who can bring together and develop a consensus on tough controversial measures must have the patience of Job and the wisdom of Solomon.

As a former Senate Democratic leader, I want to express my gratitude to Mr. DASCHLE for the service that he rendered to this Chamber, to our Nation, and to our political party.

During the interesting times in which he led the Senate, Senator

DASCHLE was always working for the common good. Because of his principled—let me say that again—because of his principled opposition to the Bush administration, critics denounced and demonized him as an obstructionist. If placing the national good over blind obedience to any President makes a Senator an obstructionist, then let me say that our democracy—indeed, all democracies—need more TOM DASCHLE's.

Senator DASCHLE stayed above it all, as he refused to engage in the gutter politics of his opponents. He always retained and maintained the dignity that has characterized him as a man and as a Senator. But then this mild-mannered South Dakota Democrat, the only South Dakotan ever to be elected to the Senate leadership, has always served the people of his State and the people of our Nation proudly and honorably, with diligence, sincerity, and distinction.

His entire career in public service has been based on standing up for the common good. He has been a true friend of rural America, especially America's farmers. Among the many measures he promoted to benefit American farmers, Senator DASCHLE pushed the development and the commercialization of alternative agricultural products.

He was an aggressive advocate of health issues, having authored legislation that expanded health services in rural areas.

As a veteran himself, having served as an intelligence officer in the Strategic Air Command of the U.S. Air Force, TOM DASCHLE was a powerful advocate for American veterans. In 1991, he won his 11-year struggle for legislation to assist Vietnam veterans suffering from exposure to Agent Orange.

I am sorry that I must now say goodbye to this decent man and this outstanding Senator, especially in such circumstances. And he is a decent man. He was always good to me. He was always listening. He always listened to whatever I had to suggest to him—always listening and always tried to be helpful. So many times he spoke good words concerning me. He was always asking about my wife Erma: How is your wife? How is your wife Erma?

But as anyone involved in politics knows, political life has its defeats as well as its victories, its sorrows as well as its joys, and we must accept them as they come, always looking forward, not backward, and knowing that the future will present other opportunities to serve our Nation.

I hope that Senator DASCHLE will continue a life of public service because our Nation will always need men of his background and experiences but, most importantly, his wisdom, his integrity, and his optimism.

Let me say on behalf of Erma and myself that we are so grateful to Senator DASCHLE and his lovely wife for their many courtesies extended to us, their many kindnesses which we will never forget. I am confident that despite the happenings of November 2,

Senator DASCHLE still sees the glass as half full rather than half empty.

And so my wife Erma and I extend our best wishes to Senator DASCHLE and his wife Linda in all of their future endeavors.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business for as much time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUDICIAL SELECTION PROCESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, recently there has been a lot of discussion about, not just the role of the judiciary in our democracy, but the process by which judges are selected. To me, this all boils down to something that Daniel Webster once said when he opined that "justice is the greatest desire of man on Earth." It is, in fact, the judges, the ones who wear the black robe, the men or women who serve on local or State or Federal benches who are the ones with whom we identify that common yearning for justice.

Unfortunately, here in the Senate over the last couple of years, we have gone through an experience that not only reeks of injustice but also of unfairness and, indeed, rises to the level of unconstitutionality when it comes to the filibuster used against President Bush's judicial nominees.

Never, before these last 2 years, has a nominee for a Federal court, whether it is the Federal district court or circuit court or the United States Supreme Court, been blocked by the use of a filibuster when there was a bipartisan majority of the Senate who stood ready to confirm that judge—never before the current Congress, dating back now 2 years.

We all know the judiciary plays a critical role in our form of government. As high school students, or perhaps even earlier, we learn that our three branches of government play important but distinct roles in our constitutional democracy. It is the judiciary, which at one time in our Nation's history has been called the least dangerous branch, that has produced some of the most dangerous decisions, at least so far as it concerns our right to self-government. What I mean by that is when we see courts strike down the Pledge of Allegiance because schoolchildren cannot say the words "under God" when they pledge allegiance to the flag; when we see county clerks, indeed, when we see judges themselves

authorize the issuance of marriage licenses to same-sex couples on TV and across our country; and when we see courts, on the basis of lawsuits that have been filed, tell military bases that they cannot grant access to their facilities to the Boy Scouts of America, we know these are not a product of a vote of the people.

In each of those instances it is the act or the dictate of a judge, a judge that I submit has lost any tether, any sort of anchor with the fundamental premises upon which the power of a judge is granted.

We want to make sure in this country, I believe, whether we are Democrats, Republicans or independents, that our judges are not politicized. In other words, we want to make sure when we walk into a courtroom when our case is decided that the judges have not already made up their minds before hearing what the facts are. We want to make sure that that judge does not have some sort of political or personal agenda which makes it impossible for them to be fair.

But what we have seen over the last couple of years is a political situation of the judicial selection process where good men and women who are highly qualified to serve as Federal judges at the Federal district court level and at the circuit court level have been not only obstructed by this unconstitutional filibuster process, which has never before been used in America history—what we have seen is also character assassination. We have seen individuals who spent a lifetime creating a reputation and developing a career as a judge totally smeared by various interest groups whose desire it is to politicize not only the judicial selection process but the decisionmaking process by judges. And that is wrong.

We know, in addition to the other important judicial vacancies that exist around this country which we have been unable to fill because of the filibuster, that in all likelihood during President Bush's second term of office he will have the opportunity to nominate one or more nominees to the U.S. Supreme Court. I am sorry to say these nominees will undoubtedly be savaged by some of these same interest groups who are bound and determined to politicize not only the act of judging—that quest for justice—but in fact the selection process itself. Unfortunately, these kinds of venomous politics are something we have come too often to expect when it comes to selecting these important members of the judiciary.

I firmly believe we are a big and diverse country. We have people who come from different places across the planet, who pronounce their name in different ways, who have different traditions, creeds, beliefs. And the great thing about this country is we can all live here in this one place and we can argue for what we strongly believe in. We can defend those views when they are attacked. But in the end, we settle those disputes—maybe not change

someone's mind but we settle the dispute at least for a while by having an election.

On November 2 of this year, 60 million people not only chose to reelect President George W. Bush, but I believe in part cast their votes for the kind of judicial nominees this President has nominated in the past and which he can be expected to nominate in the future.

Men and women are drawn to service in the judiciary because they believe in that quest for justice, and they want to play an important role in making sure that desire for justice, that quest for justice, is satisfied, at least as much as is humanly possible, in courtrooms all across this country.

But we know—at least in the past, based on sad experience—there are those who will not be satisfied with an election; that people will not put their grievances and their anger behind them but will continue to pursue these policies of destruction and character assassination when it comes to the President's judicial nominees. Unfortunately, these angry individuals have not come to accept what the vast majority of Americans have agreed is the way we should work; that is, we do our best, we fight our best fight, we get our voters out, and then we have an election and we resolve those differences at the election.

We have seen time and time again how these tactics have been used shamelessly to smear some of the President's judicial nominees. It is only logical to expect some of these same tactics, notwithstanding what I have said, will be used again.

What we have seen in this Senate—and I believe the American people cast a vote, at least in part, on November 2—is, as I have said, unconstitutional filibusters. And what I believe the American people cast a vote on on November 2, particularly when it came to the Senate minority leader race, the race in South Dakota, was a repudiation of obstructionism and the unconstitutional use of the filibuster to block the President's nominees who, if allowed the simple dignity of an up-or-down vote, would have been confirmed as I speak.

The Constitution makes clear what the role of the Senate is. That role is to provide advice and consent. Yes. The Judiciary Committee, on which I am honored to serve, has a responsibility to review the credentials and background and experience, the temperament of these nominees to make sure they understand they are not just another branch of the legislature which is at liberty to enact through judicial edict their personal or political or any other agenda. Our job is to make sure they respect the separation of powers which makes the judiciary a distinct and unique branch which is supposed to interpret the law, not make the law.

Unfortunately, we have seen an obstinate minority in this body that has denied this Congress the ability to pro-

vide that advice and consent; that is, trying to elevate the de facto requirement under the Constitution for confirmation to 60 votes by claiming that the Senate rule which requires 60 votes to cut off debate trumped the Constitution.

You might ask, How is that possible? The Constitution is the fundamental law of the United States of America, and all other laws passed, including those of Congress, are inferior to that law. If the act of Congress is inferior to that law and when it conflicts, it must fall, surely a Senate rule that purports to require a supermajority vote of the Senate to confirm judges must fall when there is conflict with the U.S. Constitution.

The Constitution provides that in specific but limited instances a supermajority vote is required for passage, notably the ratification of treaties and notably the amendment of the Constitution itself. But nowhere in the Constitution is it provided that to confirm a judge, more than a 51-vote majority is required.

That is why over these last 2 years we have heard Members on this side of the aisle time and time again come to the Senate and say not only is this filibuster unfair, but, indeed, blocking an up-or-down vote by a bipartisan majority of this body is, in fact, in violation of the fundamental law of our land.

In order to be suited by virtue of temperament to serve in elected office, you have to be an optimist by nature, and I am. It is my sincere hope, it is my sincere request and entreaty to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that these tactics stop. They must stop not only for the good of the Senate but out of respect to the President who received almost 60 million votes on November 2 and out of respect for the Constitution itself. What has happened these last 2 years is wrong, it is unfair, and, indeed, it is unconstitutional.

Should President Bush have the opportunity to nominate one or more judges to vacancies on the U.S. Supreme Court, it is my sincere hope we will have learned something from the mistakes of the past. We will have also learned there is a political penalty to be paid for obstructing judges, for treating them unfairly and in an unconstitutional fashion.

As an astute observer not only of the human condition but also of politics in general, I am confident that all of my colleagues in the Senate, all 100, paid close attention to the verdict of the American people on November 2 when it came to a referendum on whether these unconstitutional, unfair obstructionist tactics should continue or end. It is my hope we all got the same message and that, indeed, we will treat the President's nominees fairly, that we will do what the Constitution requires, that we ask the questions, make sure they are qualified by virtue of experience, education, and temperament, that they understand what the role of

the judge is, and that they are not just a legislator wearing a black robe and with lifetime tenure.

I believe on November 2 the American people rejected the tactics of obstructionism and demonization of the President's nominees. Frankly, I worry that the good men and women who have been nominated by the President to serve in these important positions, after those behind them see how they have been treated, or I should say mistreated, how long can we expect other good men and women, when called by the President, will answer the call only to know they will be smeared, strung out before the world and, indeed, then, obstructed by an unconstitutional process?

It is my hope we will have learned something over these last 2 years and to repudiate these tactics.

I will say something to my constituents and the people who may be listening who have contacted my office in very sincere concern for what they have seen played out on the Senate floor and in the judicial confirmation process.

I say to all of them, I appreciate your passion. I appreciate your concern. I appreciate your interest in the instruments of the Government that ultimately the people of this country control. We are going to need the involvement, the attention, the passion of all of the people and, indeed, we are going to need to appeal to our better angels in the Senate and in the Senate Judiciary Committee when it comes to the next nominees for the U.S. Supreme Court.

We all remember, whether it is the confirmation process by which Judge Bork was blocked, by which Clarence Thomas was ultimately confirmed—after going through a process that no one should have to go through—my hope is we will have learned that is not the way the Senate should conduct itself and that we will resolve among ourselves and resolve among the American people and to the people we represent that we will treat the President's judicial nominees fairly, that we will treat them with dignity, and that we will provide the up-or-down vote the U.S. Constitution demands when it comes to the confirmation of the President's judicial nominees.

I am not suggesting for a minute that anyone violate their conscience. Indeed, any Senator with a sincere belief that an individual judge should not be confirmed should come to the Senate, as no doubt they will, and explain to their colleagues why they feel so strongly, why they conscientiously object to this nominee and invoke their conscience. Every Senator should do that, and I trust they will.

But no one, no Senator has the right, no group of Senators has the right, no minority has the right to tyrannize the majority of the Senate when we stand ready in a bipartisan fashion to cast a vote, up or down, for a judicial nominee.

I sincerely hope we will not have only learned from the mistakes of the past when it comes to obstruction of the President's judicial nominees, but we will conduct ourselves with the kind of dignity the American people have come to expect from Senators and that we will conduct ourselves uprightly, with fairness and dignity, and treat all we come in contact exactly the same way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I intend to speak on another matter at some point. I see several of my colleagues are in the Senate. Senator LEVIN, I believe, wishes to speak for a short time. I see Senator BOND is in the Senate, as well.

I will take 5 minutes to say I have deep respect for my colleague from Texas. I like him and I am pleased he is a Member of this body. I have deep disagreement with what he has said, and I will take this moment to respond to it.

There is a newfound passion, apparently, for providing votes for nominees for judgeships. When I say a newfound passion, let me explain that I was here in the 1990s. There were 60 nominees for the Federal court that never got a vote in the Senate by a Republican-controlled Senate. Many of them never even got 1 day of hearings. It was unbelievable what went on with the majority party in this Chamber when the Clinton administration was sending down nominees.

Contrary to what my colleague just indicated, this notion of obstructionism, this is a newfound technique. You create your own reality and debate from that reality. There was no obstructionism. This Senate approved 201 Federal judges; 201 of the nominations for Federal judgeships that were sent down here by this President. We held up about 10 of them.

Now, the Constitution says something about our obligations. This is not about obstruction. It is not about unconstitutional behavior. It is not anything of the sort. It is about those in the Senate who understand that the Constitution says we have a responsibility when it comes to putting someone on the Federal bench for a lifetime.

When someone sends a name to this Senate as this President did that says, I want this man to serve for a lifetime on the Federal bench—by the way, this person has a record of writing articles saying that his belief is that women are subservient to men—I say, wait a second. It is not somebody I want to sit on the Federal bench for a lifetime. I don't happen to think that sort of thinking represents what I want to put on the Federal bench.

We held up, I believe, 10 nominees and approved 201. We approved 93 percent of the President's requests. We are told this is obstructionism? And now we are told, today, there is a lesson in the South Dakota Senate race as a re-

sult of this? This "obstructionism" created a result in the Senate race in South Dakota of which we all need to be mindful?

Let me state what the South Dakota Senate race was about. It was not about obstructionism and judgeships. It was about \$20 million coming out of the basement of the White House through various orifices and devices, directed at the minority leader in the State of South Dakota in a campaign that in many respects, in my judgment, was shameful. But it was not about obstructionism. It was not about judges because the fact is we approved 201 Federal nominees sent to us by this President. We have been extraordinarily cooperative.

Let me say again, I was here during 8 years of the Clinton administration when 60 nominees were sent down here that never got a vote. Some of them never got one day of hearings. Let me say that on my behalf I want to cooperate with this President. But my colleagues and I have constitutional responsibilities with respect to putting someone on a Federal bench for a lifetime that involves two steps: One, the President proposes a nominee; and, second, under advice and consent, the Senate then makes its judgement. We have a responsibility here. It is a constitutional responsibility.

I have read and reread that Constitution. I am proud of what we have done. We have been extraordinarily cooperative with this President and will continue to be so. But that does not mean all of us walk to this Chamber with ink on our shoes and become a giant rubber stamp to say: Me too. Yes, sign me up. OK, I am fine, I am with you. It is not our role and it is not our responsibility.

When we approved 201 Federal nominees to the Federal court from this President, which was 93 percent of the nominees of this President, I think it strains credibility to somehow call this obstructionism. And it certainly strains our sense of irony to hear those calling us obstructionists when not very long ago there were 60 nominees, some of which never got a day of hearings, and none of which got a vote on the floor of the Senate.

Going forward, I think we ought to understand this: The so-called lesson we were described moments ago about the election in South Dakota, that is all nonsense. It is not what that was about. We believe we have a responsibility to cooperate. We will. We also believe we have a constitutional responsibility to use our heads, our hearts and our minds to make good decisions about the future of this country. We will continue to do that as well.

Incidentally, I have in my hand a record of two votes during the Clinton administration where there were cloture motions that were required for nominees. So this notion that somehow it is the first time ever there was a filibuster, nonsense, that's just not true.

I have records of both votes. It has been done before. It has been done by the majority party. It is just when they do not get 100 percent of their nominees, they do not get a rubber stamp coming out of this Chamber, that somehow they have a problem with that. The American people should not have a problem with it. The Constitution certainly does not have a problem with it, and I do not.

I want to be cooperative, but I do not want to sit and listen to a re-creation of reality that does not square with what we have done in the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wonder if I could ask unanimous consent to line up speakers. Does the Senator from North Dakota want to do that? And is that agreeable to the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oklahoma that speakers be lined up by unanimous consent? When I asked Senator DORGAN to yield to me for 5 minutes, he was wondering if he could then be next in order. But I know Senator BOND is here, too.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me follow Senator BOND.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes. If I could ask the Senator from North Dakota about how much time will he be using?

Mr. DORGAN. I intended to use 20 minutes. I would be happy to follow the Senator.

Mr. INHOFE. I would be close to that amount of time, too, so I will go ahead and wait. If I could lock in after the Senator from North Dakota, that is fine.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me suggest the Senator from Michigan begin, and then be followed by the Senator from Missouri, and then myself, followed by the Senator from Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that be the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE VOTES FOR JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, while Senator DORGAN is in the Chamber, he made reference to the fact there have been cloture votes required on judges throughout the years. I want to expand on the RECORD some of the names of judges where cloture votes were required, in fact, where cloture votes were not agreed to and led to their defeat in a number of instances: Justice Fortas in 1968; now Justice Bryer but then circuit court nominee Steven Bryer in 1980, with two cloture motions; Rosemary Barkett, to the Eleventh Circuit in 1994; Lee Sarokin in 1994, with a cloture motion required; Marsha Berzon in the year 2000; Richard Paez in the year 2000.

Cloture is not a new phenomenon when it comes to the debate over

judges. Yet we hear now that suddenly the requirement that there be a cloture vote is something that is new to this Senate. It is not. It has been historically used. It is appropriate, and it is rare.

As Senator DORGAN pointed out, 93 percent of the judges who were nominated by President Bush were confirmed when there were votes that came to the floor of the Senate. Ninety-three percent of these judges were confirmed. And the comparison to that of the Clinton years, where so many judges could not even get a hearing, where there was a filibuster in the Judiciary Committee because of the refusal to grant judges a hearing, is quite a contrast. We do not hear much about that. Instead, hearing that the refusal to have an up-or-down vote and a requirement for cloture is somehow labeled obstructionism is altogether out of line, as far as I am concerned, and inaccurate historically, inappropriate, and needs to be contested.

TRIBUTES TO RETIRING SENATORS

TOM DASCHLE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, that is not why I came to the floor, although it relates to why I came to the floor this afternoon because I came here to pay tribute to a dear friend, our Democratic leader, TOM DASCHLE of South Dakota. This sadness is only tempered by the belief that TOM DASCHLE will continue to play a vital role in our Nation's public life in the future.

TOM DASCHLE has had a distinguished career as a legislator on behalf of the interests of the people of South Dakota and all of the people of our Nation. He has fought for a fair share for the farmers of his State and for farmers around the country. He has been in the forefront of rural health, veterans' health, a fair tax system, and a very broad range of other issues.

He has been as a leader of the Democrats in the Senate, both as majority leader and minority leader, through one of the most difficult periods of the Senate's history where TOM DASCHLE has made his mark. He has been a remarkable leader. As a principled and tireless advocate for the issues he believes in, he has led by example. On countless difficult and contentious issues, he has led by carefully listening to all sides. Time and time again, on complex and challenging legislation, he has led by tireless negotiation and by building consensus. And, where appropriate, he has been able to organize Democrats to insist on our rights as a minority in the Senate.

It is, indeed, a bitter irony of the most recent election that TOM DASCHLE, who is a legislator to the core, and a man of compromise and soft-spoken wisdom, a seeker of dialogue, solutions, and consensus, was caricatured as an obstructionist. In the time-honored tradition of Senate leaders of both parties, he stood tall when

principle required it. In reality, though, it was TOM DASCHLE's style to reach across the aisle, time and time again, in an effort to legislate in the Nation's best interest. Often he worked closely with the Republican leader in some of the Senate's finest and most difficult hours.

In the face of a very difficult impeachment trial that tested this Senate, in response to the September 11 terrorist attacks, and when he himself was targeted in the anthrax attack, as in countless other instances, TOM DASCHLE demonstrated his talent for calm, inclusive, and wise leadership.

As this session of Congress ends in the next few days, the people of South Dakota will be losing a vigorous, effective, and committed Senator. Democrats in this body, indeed, all Senators, will be losing a great leader. And all Americans will be losing a voice of reason, judgment, and wisdom. I will be losing a friend and a confidante. TOM DASCHLE is a beautiful human being and a nonpareil leader. His good nature will enable him to overcome this momentary defeat so that the contributions he makes to public life will soon flower in a different place.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SHELBY be recognized for 10 minutes following me, and that Senator BREAUX be recognized for 15 minutes thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOHN BREAUX

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it has been a pleasure to work with the Senator from Louisiana. We have appreciated his leadership on many issues not only important to Louisiana but to our energy future and important to navigation in the heartland, which is something that is vitally important for all of us.

LEADERSHIP AT THE CIA

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about an old-fashioned virtue: doing what you said you were going to do. That is a test a lot of people apply in politics. They say if you tell us what you are going to do when you get elected, are you going to do it?

It seems to me in the intelligence field we have an example of that. The reaction is somewhat surprising. We have had, I think, 128 or 130 hearings in the Intelligence Committee since I joined it in January 2003. One of the lessons we learned is that, while there are many outstanding dedicated men and women in the CIA and throughout the intelligence community, the system is broken; it didn't give us the adequate or accurate prediction of the scope of the terrorist danger to the U.S. before 9/11. We went into Iraq with the Director of Central Intelligence so confident of the intelligence analysis